

The LITURGICAL REVOLUTION

by JEAN VAQUIÉ

(English Resumé by Solange Hertz)

Published in 1971 by Diffusion de la Pensee Francaise (Chire-en-Montreuil, 86190 Vouille - France) with a preface by Leon de Poncins, this important work presents an acute two-part analysis of (1) Vatican Council II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of December 4, 1963 and (2) the Novus Ordo Missae of April 3, 1969, together with lessons to be learned from both. In brief, the text reads as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY:

The author sees the fateful Constitution as "a master-plan, initiating a fundamental transformation, and drawing its inspiration from two contradictory doctrines." Through a program designed to be worked out later on three levels (Papal "Concilium", national liturgical commissions and diocesan liturgical commissions), specifically mandated were: revision of the Mass (art. 50), a new rite for concelebration (art. 58), revision of the double rite of Baptism (art. 66), Confirmation (art. 71), the rite and formulas for Penance (art. 72), Holy Orders (art. 76), Marriage (art. 77), and the Sacramentals (art. 79).

We were doomed, it seems, to the present confusion by the enunciation of contradictions. For instance, liturgy is regarded equally as cult and pedagogy (art. 33); Latin is the language of the Church, yet so is the vernacular (arts. 36, 54, 101); and rites are to be revised in the light of tradition while being made to conform to present conditions in the world (art. 4). These equivocations in subsequent practice have been interpreted always in the liberal sense.

Enumerating the characteristics of the new liturgy as enounced by the Council, M. Vaquie finds four: It is didactic, evolutionary, democratic and free.

Its didacticism is evident in its bi-polarity, which allows both "the Table of the Lord's Body" and the "Table of the Word," with emphasis always carefully placed on the latter. With this pronounced bias, it champions the vernacular as most suited to its catechetical purposes, and by establishing no fixed limits between its use and that of Latin, soon displaces Latin entirely. So with the new rite of concelebration ordered to the "service of the Word," and the altar turned towards the people, which soon displaced the pulpit. To cap it all, the new liturgical cycle, void of stability and permanence, teaches change itself as immutable.

The principle of "permanent evolution" (art. 21) engineered an erosion of essentials in the name of convenience to the faithful and adaptation to differing cultures and mentalities (arts. 34, 40). Meanwhile, contrariwise, the democratic "Sacrament of Unity" administered through group participation effected a veritable subjugation of the people into a solid bloc where all hierarchy is in fact eliminated. Public cultus, essentially a work of Jesus Christ, is becoming that of the people (art. 26), part and parcel of "collegiality" and the mania for concelebration. This last has now become the major rite, despite the fact that it is a pure innovation, never once mentioned by St. Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas or St. Bonaventure in their treatises on the Mass.

Freedom in the new liturgy is now easily seen stemming from article 37, placing emphasis as it does on sincerity and spontaneity. From here de-sacralization has progressed by promoting familiar forms of address to Almighty God, ritual celebrations in non-consecrated locales, loss of stability in forms, and canonized ad-libbing. With the altar turned around, Jesus Christ has in fact become the mediator between priest and people!

+

These astounding reversals were welcomed by faithful and clergy alike in a spirit of obedience. How so? Well, says our author, the faithful found it only too easy to bring into the sanctuary the liberalism, the democracy and the evolution they had been finding it so hard to keep out. The clergy, on the other hand, liked a program which seemed to promote them to

masters of the liturgy whereas heretofore they had been its servants. Of course the changes were immediately acclaimed by liberals for the simple reason that the Constitution had been in fact their work, and the liberal clergy had already projected its own disaffection onto the laity.

The pre-Conciliar years were indeed decisive ones. There had been a concerted campaign of long standing to discredit the ancient liturgy on the grounds of "Constantinian triumphalism" and impatience with its mystery and majesty; so that the decisions reached in the smoke-filled rooms outside the Council were easily railroaded through the official sessions. In due time accepted without question were ecumenism, catechetical priorities, the vernacular, the elimination of Gregorian, mutationism and community liturgy.

Traditionalists opposing these were hamstrung by two difficulties: First, their adversaries' true motives were unknown to them, as was also the extent of masonic and communist infiltration into Council ranks. Their ignorance was cultivated, their intelligence lulled by ambiguity. Secondly, they were unprepared for the "para-Council" of the media, especially the press conferences, by which bishops were intoxicated by the new ideas under pretext of informing them. Public opinion was brought to bear on every vote.

M. Vaquie would have us know, nevertheless, that the leaders and organizers of liberalism were bishops, many owing their episcopacy to their liberalism. Believing that masonry no longer fights the Church because it is now running it, he maintains we are heading overtly into a universal religion to match the universal republic now in process of formation. It will be a gnosis, says he, a theosophy devoid of orthodoxy, which allows all truths, all errors, to exist side by side in the masonic super-church. To achieve its end, masonry consistently supports indifferentism, tolerance, syncretism (vide arts. 37, 40, 65), and of course ecumenism. Only the true Faith will rise against all this.

Marxist infiltrators, on the other hand, in the accustomed marxist spirit of "use and destroy", are backing nationalized Churches, Christian charity (especially by subordinating love of God to love of man), religious fellowship of all kinds, and needless to say, community liturgy. M. Vaquie holds that the first wave of liberals inspired by masonry (in whose ranks he places Jacques Maritain and our present Pope), has now been overtaken by a revolutionary wave inspired and directed by crypto-marxists. The first group sincerely believed progress compatible with tradition; the second harbor no such illusions, and they now have the bit in their teeth.

The conclusion is that the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy provided the initial means to force us to go through the motions of the new religion without revealing its true theology to us, which is, briefly: a new concept of the laity as priest, and a new doctrine on hierarchy which replaces hierarchy by community. Its lex orandi is bringing us to its new lex credendi.

Traditionalists have made a poor showing thus far. This in spite of the fact that after the briefest "wait and see," Msgr. Noirot laid down the gauntlet in L'Ami du Clerge on April 30, 1964: "Despite its title of Constitution, the present text has only a disciplinary character. Canonically speaking, it possesses only the value of a decree, and the decisions it contains are neither infallible nor irreformable."

This clear definition was not acted on mainly because the liberal strategy hadn't been grasped, namely that the attack on doctrine was to take place by means of the liturgy. Secondly, traditionalists generally subscribed to the notion that liturgy is changeable. And finally, they attributed the infallibility of a doctrinal council to one that was in fact purely pastoral. This despite the fact that Pope Paul himself on Dec. 12, 1966 said clearly: "Given its pastoral character, the Council has avoided making extraordinary pronouncements on dogmas endowed with the mark of infallibility."

Traditionalists came forward with their non possumus only when the new catechetics appeared, having let the liturgy go by. This put them hopelessly behind in the fight, and now bishops are paralyzed by "collegiality." They assumed the Council was good in principle, but its decrees misapplied, whereas, even if applied and interpreted by traditionalists, the decrees would have borne bad fruit, but these would have appeared less swiftly.

The studied methods of the reformers were in fact the following (1) Council documents were always interpreted in the liberal sense. (2) Work proceeded very gradually, the full extent of their plans never made known, by a process of de-sacralization which slowly substituted man for God, leading to the worship of a super-man who in the final analysis can only be Antichrist. (3) Plausible pretexts acceptable to traditionalists were always given, as, for instance, the "enrichment" which these changes would bring to the liturgy. (4) A grand orchestration of the program with press and news agencies. A good example of the last is the March 8, 1969 issue of Paris-Match, wherein readers were informed that at the magazine's request their letters would be forwarded to the National Pastoral Council for answers to questions they might have.

By these four means the liturgical revolution was not only accelerated but greatly widened in scope; but this followed only logically from the Constitution itself, which provided for the creation of the necessary committees, and from the Council as a whole, where liberals first seized power. Not comprehending this, traditionalists limited themselves to a fatal resistance with obedience, which means a rearguard action. Both parties brandished the same Constitution, but had it opened to different passages.

Traditionalists didn't back down, but they barricaded themselves behind two lines of fortification they considered impregnable, but which in fact were not: the Constitution itself, and the personal will of the Pope. The latter, holding tradition and progress compatible and dealing out the same ambiguities as the Constitution, soon appointed liberals to all positions of influence. It was assumed that the situation could be remedied by ordinary means, but now we know this is not possible.

"The situation is inextricable," says M. Vaquie. "We are caught between two realities, one as certain as the other, but which are contradictory: The hierarchy is perfectly legitimate, but it is presently overshadowed."

That we are approaching such confusion as was foreseen by the visionary Madeleine Porsat is not improbable. Actually the hierarchy is blinded, its one ray of light from the Holy Spirit being the knowledge that the Council is pastoral and not doctrinal, and therefore not infallible. This means its acts are happily not irreversible. As things stand now, however, the power of the liberal hierarchy can only grow, our dilemma being that whereas we cannot obey it without reservation, neither can we break with it, for it is the legitimate spiritual authority.

The author believes that God will remedy the situation by extraordinary means in due time; but meanwhile the Church must be given over to liberalism, not only for our sins, but that we may learn by hard experience that aggiornamento inexorably leads to revolution, and that the new liturgy, using community techniques, relentlessly fashions defenseless worshippers into marxists. Not mincing words, he is ready to acknowledge that we are being prepared for the Antichrist, as predicted by Pope St. Pius X in 1903.

He concludes, "The Holy See itself is undertaking such administrative changes that through ordinary channels it would be impossible for the next Pope to be anything but a veritable subversive. With all the Cardinals bad, how could they elect a good Pope without extraordinary intervention on God's part? Have we ever seen a like situation?"

THE NEW LITURGY OF THE MASS according to the *Ordo Missae* of April 3, 1969:

Article 50 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy states: "The rite of the Mass is to be revised." Given the state of the Church at the time, this could only have been undertaken in the direction of modernism. Vatican Council II imposed it. As always, both traditional and liberal principles were enunciated side by side, but the former remained dead letters inasmuch as the implementers were all liberals. As usual, the traditionalists were taken in by the facade.

As the Constitution had been a master-plan, a decree whose finer points were to be filled in later, so was the normative new Mass a master-Mass whose details were yet to appear.

Phase one in liberal strategy was an attack against Latin. The vernacular had to be introduced for two reasons: (1) A breach somewhere had to be made before the assault on the citadel of the Missal itself, and (2) the field had to be cleared for translations, by means of which dogma could be subtly watered down. This once accomplished, the liberals set themselves to dismantling that traditional stronghold, the Mass of St. Pius V. As we know, in order to achieve this, the Apostolic Authority of the Pope eventually had to be called into play.

Phase two, the first attack by means of the "normative" Mass, was a failure.

To integrate the Mass into the new universal religion, it had to be de-sacralized in order to be acceptable to non-Christians. A rite was therefore put together which was not positively heretical -- this would never have got by -- but sufficiently pliable to absorb later changes. In accordance with art. 41 of the Constitution an experimental Mass, celebrated by Msgr. Annibale Bugnini, was proposed before 183 Council Fathers gathered for the Synod of Sept. 1967 in the Sistine Chapel.

In this Mass the Kyrie, Gloria and Offertory were eliminated, the Confiteor pulverized. The saints, the souls in Purgatory and anything emphasizing the personal offering of the priest were glossed over. The words of Consecration were "corrected." Four inter-changeable canons were submitted, and of course Latin was replaced by the vernacular. Called "normative" because it was presented as a general model adaptable to any occasion, it was structured under unchangeable headings (Entrance Rite, Readings, Offertory Rite, Consecratory Rite, Communion Rite, Dismissal Rite) which allowed all manner of variation under each head.

Here are more details:

- Prayers at the foot of the altar were suppressed.
- The abridged Confiteor was recited by the celebrant and congregation together.
- The number and variety of the prayers were to be increased in due time.
- The faithful might sing the Kyrie or the Gloria, but not both.
- Readings were increased to three: One from the Old Testament, the Epistle and the Gospel, with much liberty in choice of texts.
- The homily was retained, as also the Credo on Sundays and feastdays.
- The "Prayer of the Faithful" was made of obligation and no longer optional as it had been until then.
- The Offertory was reduced to the most minimal form possible, much like the present one. The reason given was that anything anticipating the Canon was redundant.
- Only an Amen was to be sung by the congregation at the close of the Preface, the Sanctus having been eliminated.
- The Eucharistic Prayer was to be treated separately according to five texts: (1) The traditional Roman Canon, (2) A canon inspired by the anaphora of St. Hippolytus, but shortened, (3) A canon concocted on the model of the Preface, praising God as Lord of Creation, to accommodate the sensibilities of non-Christians, and (4) An "ecumenical" canon allegedly derived from the anaphora of St. Basil. This multiplicity resulted actually in differing formulas of Consecration.
- After the Pater Noster, much emphasis was laid on the Rite of Peace, in which the congregation was now to take full part.
- The Agnus Dei was retained.
- Communion was so arranged that priest and people all partook together around the Eucharistic Table.

-- A period of silence and some singing followed Communion.

-- The Rite of Dismissal would vary according to circumstances.

From the foregoing two essential principles emerge: (1) De-sacralization. Although the notion of sacrifice was retained, the tendency was to give priority to "teaching." (2) Variability. Free choice of texts opened the way for introducing other religions into the norm.

This "normative" Mass was rejected by the Fathers of the Synod by a comfortable majority. Cardinals Lercaro and Bugnini, whose work the Mass primarily was, had overestimated the dose of liberalism the Synod could swallow at the time. They saw they must proceed more slowly.

+

A year and a half later, on April 3, 1969, Holy Thursday, Pope Paul VI promulgated a document on the Mass almost identical to the one the Fathers of the Synod had rejected. It comprised (1) the Novus Ordo Missae itself and (2) the Institutio Generalis, spelling out the intention of the legislator.

These two pronouncements presented the same double doctrine as the Conciliar decree they implemented, for the Fathers' veto dictated caution on the part of the Holy See. Because the new Mass was substantially the same as the one voted down, an accompanying commentary that would dispel suspicion was imperative. A traditionalist examining the Institutio would therefore find duly mentioned (1) the notion of sacrifice in art. 259, (2) the use of the word altar in Arts. 65, 71, 94, 103, 107, (3) the word hostia for victim in art. 113 and three of the eucharistic prayers, (4) the Real Presence affirmed in art. 7, and (5) the priest referred to as celebrant in art. 60.

On the other hand, a liberal reading the same document would see: (1) the Mass called Table of the Lord and Memorial of the Lord in art. 7, (2) the altar called table in several places, (3) the priest as "president" in art. 7, (4) the Presence of Christ subject to a four-fold definition allowing for much interpretation, and (5) the priesthood of the faithful presented in terms according them a semi-ministerial role. Article 7 alone, says M. Vaquie, is a masterpiece of equivocation.

+

The traditional definition of the Mass has always been crystal-clear in the catechism: "The Mass is the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, offered to God under the species of bread and wine, in order to renew and perpetuate the Sacrifice of the Cross."

In the first form in which it appeared, article 7's definition embodied two essential anomalies: (1) The notion of sacrifice offered to God is entirely missing. Mass exists only for the instruction and nourishment of the faithful. (2) Heterodox notions are present, e.g., that Mass is an assembly, a commemorative ceremony, that the people celebrate and the priest presides. And be it noted that this strange definition explicitly refers to arts. 33, 48, 51 and 56 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, which remains the initial source of deviation.

Article 7 in its first form provoked such consternation that the Pope was forced to rectify it. On November 19, 1969 he rendered his own definition of the Mass, reading substantially, "The Mass is and remains (!) the memorial of the Supper in the course of which the Lord instituted the Sacrifice of the New Testament."

M. Vaquie dubs this "pseudo-rectification," actually a softened confirmation of the original article 7, because although our Lord did institute the Mass in the course of the Supper on Holy Thursday, it was on the Cross that He actually offered His Sacrifice. The reference to the Supper is therefore not enough. Furthermore, the expression "sacrifice of the New Testament" in no way clearly designates the unique historical Sacrifice of Calvary.

Some prelates accepted this, but most did not, so that article 7 was changed into its present form, where the word sacrifice is carefully incorporated, but with all the liberal notions nonetheless undeleted.

Article 7 enumerates four modes of Christ's presence in the Mass: (1) in the assembly gathered together in His name, (2) in His Word, (3) in the person of the priest, and finally (4) sacramentally.

No one quarrels with this teaching as such; nevertheless, the only mode which specifically pertains to the Mass is the Sacramental Presence, because only this one is Real as well as spiritual. The three others are only spiritual and therefore not specific to the Mass. To include them is simply a ploy for introducing the ministry of the people into the divine Action. Thus Pope Paul VI in his comments on the Novus Ordo and the Institutio on November 26, 1969: "... more than ever, to render the Mass a school for spiritual deepening and an exercise that is peaceful, but involving Christian sociology." (!!)

+

Ambiguity isn't liberalism's only tool. Another is diverting Catholic terminology from its true sense. For instance, priesthood according to traditional teaching is only interior as regards the faithful. It is personal and spiritual. All the Fathers of the Church have understood it so, not only following the Council of Trent but our first Pope and Paul the Apostle who spoke of the people as offering "spiritual sacrifice" (1 Pet. 2:5; Rom. 12:1). This priesthood is also "common" in the sense that all the baptized possess it. (It is not "universal" in the Protestant sense, which does not distinguish between clergy and faithful.)

The priesthood of the priest, on the other hand, is exterior. It is ministerial, public, material. In the ancient Mass this distinction from the faithful is clearly set forth ritually. For instance, priest and people say the Confiteor separately, and at the Oration Fratres the priest refers to "my sacrifice and yours." Because this is an obstacle to re-union with Protestants, the Institutio is at pains to present the priest as barely a primus inter pares.

The traditional Mass carefully prescribed the words and actions of the priest down to the smallest detail, whereas the new Mass lays emphasis on creativity, provision being made for endless variations and adaptations. But there is one exception: the new Offertory Prayer, which reads: "Blessed are you, Lord, God of the universe, because from your bounty we have bread, which we offer You, the fruit of the earth, work of human hands, etc." This particular prayer occurs in all new Masses.

Jean Madiran, editor of "Itineraries", put it thus: "To me it seems absolutely impossible in conscience that acceptance of the new Mass -- insofar as it is possible and necessary to accept it -- could ever go beyond a prudent, circumspect and sorrowful acceptance with reservation."

Postulating fidelity to the Mass of St. Pius V, Fr. Calmel declared he must refuse the Novus Ordo. Why? Because in reality this Ordo does not exist. What does exist is a universal, permanent liturgical revolution undertaken or desired by the present Pope. . . I consider it my priestly duty to refuse to celebrate Mass in an equivocal rite." ("Itineraires" Jan. 1970)

And in like vein many others, alleging the Novus Ordo's equivocation, dubious juridical position, predisposition to heresy, and last but not least, possible sacrilege. Milder resistance arose from groups like Una Voce, who were prepared to settle for liturgical duality. They petitioned for retention of the Tridentine Mass as a separate rite in the name of the very pluralism "so wisely recommended by the Holy Father." There was also the famous "Appeal of the One Hundred" to save the ancient Mass, signed by figures from the secular world who advocated its preservation on cultural and esthetic grounds, if nothing else as a piece of priceless folklore.

+

M. Vaquie maintains the Ordo of St. Pius V is more than that, in fact more than just a papal law. "Essentially it is a codified thousand year old custom," not only unabrogated to date, but displaced by a law dubious for the following reasons: (1) It was put together

in collaboration with heretics. (2) It suffers fraudulent modifications from one edition to the next. (3) The protestantized definition of the Mass, changed in the Institutio, caused no corresponding change in the rite itself. (4) The tyrannical manner in which it has been enforced, and (5) Its latest form appeared as a notification bearing neither date nor signature. (Vide L'Osservatore Romano, 6/16/71.) Such irregularities are unprecedented in the history of the Church, besides the fact that the official justifications have been insincere and incoherent, the theological bases occult, drawn from masonry and marxism.

Unfortunately traditionalist resistance remains far from unanimous. Many advise submission to the hierarchy on the grounds of validity and licity, stressing the dangers of disobedience, their arguments more disciplinary than theological. (The author feels this contingent is as good as dead.) Also many believed the Novus Ordo would never be imposed in so absolute a manner as it has. "Paul VI sometimes gives the impression of hesitancy because he allows embarrassing situations to deteriorate. It's a way of wearing out his adversaries. But he is very consistent in his ideas. At the right moment he knows how to use his authority with brutal force." We know he categorically refused Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci their request for option between the two Missals.

"Thus disappeared the Missale Romanum, which was the customary one for centuries, at least since we emerged from the catacombs, and which St. Pius V codified during the Renaissance. Paul VI declares it inadequate. He forbids it. He condemns it on the grounds of its having become unintelligible. This is an absolutely unheard of act of authoritarianism." Although the Pope possesses ultimate powers as regards liturgy, these are not discretionary powers, but powers ordered to conservation and good administration. Although it is true that he must keep the liturgy free of excrescences that do not come from the Holy Spirit, he is first and foremost the guardian of tradition.

"The Mass of Paul VI is a Mass of transition, or rather, a Mass of demolition." Two scriptural phrases most characterize the present situation: "the abomination of desolation in the holy place," and "I shall strike the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered."

Whereas the Council divided the faithful into liberals and traditionalists, the Novus Ordo has created a new division within the traditionalists: those adhering to the old Missal resting on immutability and those adhering to the new resting on apostolic authority. Two main currents have been created: that of discipline, and that of orthodoxy. Normally the hierarchy regulates both, through its administration of the Sacraments and through its teaching function. The first guards unity, the second truth. Today the faithful are being torn between the two, with those choosing to be faithful to truth finding themselves in danger of substituting themselves for the hierarchy, thereby risking schism.

Fr. Boudier, the hermit of Vidauban, says, "I want to obey, but whom?" St. Pius X, who condemned modernism, or Paul VI who puts it into practice? The partisans of unity feel it's safer to obey the present Pope, feeling that if the hierarchy leads them astray they will be blameless. M. Vaquie thinks otherwise, quoting La Salette:

"Lucifer and a great number of devils will be unchained from hell; they will gradually abolish the Faith and even persons consecrated to God; they will blind them in such a way that without a special grace these persons will take on the spirit of these bad angels; many religious houses will lose the Faith entirely and damn many souls."

He feels it is impossible not to slip oneself if one accepts a slippery rite. He takes for example article 56 of the Institutio, which reads, "It is desirable that the faithful receive the Body of Christ in hosts consecrated at the Mass itself, so that by such signs Communion will appear more as participation in the sacrifice actually celebrated."

He shows that obeying this literally would lead automatically to feeling that hosts left over from a previous Mass and taken from the tabernacle are somehow secondrate. People receiving these will feel their participation not as complete as it should be. Eventually we come to the conclusion that tabernacles aren't necessary, inasmuch as we should receive only "fresh" hosts. Next, why not subscribe to the heresy that Christ is Really present only for the duration of Communion, as some now teach? Thus we become liberals through blind obedience. Only the most obstinate could withstand the brain-washing of the new liturgy. The most prudent course is to remain aloof from the new Mass.

The divisions the Novus Ordo has caused are no mark of the Holy Spirit. Pope and Council, the two highest authorities in the Church, have failed. This, says M. Vaquie, makes the situation humanly insoluble. In the long run, of course, the old Missal will survive, because it was made to last, whereas the new was precisely designed for change. The counter-revolution is now in full swing, but victory can't be expected soon inasmuch as secular forces are on the side of the revolution.

We must expect violence now, and trickery, favorite ploys against us being pseudo-reaction and incitement to discord within traditional ranks. And, warns the author, let the laity now keep its hands off the liturgy. The layman had to speak out in the beginning because of the silence of the clergy, but now these are speaking out, having recovered from the initial shock. Liturgy is their preserve, and good traditional priests and theologians have taken up the weapons only they have the grace to wield properly.

Traditional liturgy is entirely ordered to God, His glory more important even than the salvation of souls. Thus Dom Guéranger: "Confession, prayer and praise, such are the principal acts of religion; such are also the principal forms of liturgy. Confession, by which the Church renders homage to God for the truth she has received from Him, repeating a thousand times in His presence the triumphant creed which contains in earthly language truths which are of heaven."

+ + +

(With permission, Diffusion de la Pensee Francaise, Chire-en-Montreuil, 86190 Vouille, France)



Copies of this article are 50¢ each from BIG ROCK PAPERS, R2 Box 158, Leesburg, Va. 22075

Also, THE STRANGE SPIRIT OF '76. Whence it comes, whither it goes. \$1.00
THE TRIUMPH OF THE GREEN DRAGON. The beginnings of our National Catholic Church \$1.00
THE OCCULT FRANKLIN. The true faith of our Founding Fathers \$1.00
LOUIS XVI: ROYAL VICTIM AND MARTYR. His acceptable sacrifice 50¢
THE STAR-SPANGLED CHURCH How Marxism did it. \$1.50
LORD BALTIMORE'S BUNGLE. The early ecumania. 50¢
THE HANGING OF MARY SURRETT. Our sinister Civil War. \$1.00
SAINT CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS? America's discovery in the Mystical Body. 50¢
THE MASONIC PEACE OF 1919. The modern groundwork. 50¢
MASS IN THE LATTER DAYS. What happens if it disappears? 50¢
THE PASSION OF THE CHURCH. What Scripture leads us to expect. 50¢
THE SECRET OF LA SALETTE. The inside story with imprinted text. 50¢
THE HOLY ROSARY. Our ultimate liturgy. 50¢
THE IRISH CONNECTION. The Hibernian roots of Americanism. \$1.50
THE BATTLE FOR AMERINDIA. America's struggle in the Mystical Body. \$2.00
IS THE BLACK MASS VALID? On knowing the Gnosis. \$1.00
PRINCIPAL LAWS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. The authoritative bedrock. 50¢

Also, THE THOUGHT OF HIS HEART. Sacred Heart devotion in today's light. \$2.00
SIN REVISITED. The Desert Fathers' psychology of sin. For YOU. \$2.50

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LISTING